

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1, 3 to 16, 27 and 28 are pending in the application. Claims 2 and 17 to 26 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 to 12 and 14 to 16 have been rejected. Claims 2, 5, 6 and 13 were indicated to be allowable if amended to overcome the objections of the Examiner. Claim 27 has been allowed. Claim 28 is new.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claim 2. Claim 2 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

New Claim 28 is a combination of Claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 as originally filed. Claim 5, as originally filed, was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the Office Action

(1) Claims 1, 3, 8 to 10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kintzi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,782) in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 988,558) and Sawyer (U.S. Patent

No. 3,925,822). The references have been described in detail in a previous Amendment and that discussion need not be repeated.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent Claim 2. Claim 2 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

(2) Claims 4, 7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kintzi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,782) in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 988,558) and Sawyer (U.S. Patent No. 3,925,822) as applied to Claims 3 and 8 above and further in view of Takada (U.S. Patent No. 3,885,811). The references have been described in detail in a previous Amendment and that discussion need not be repeated.

Applicants believe that in view of the amendment of Claim 1, dependent Claims 4, 7, 11 and 12, as depending from unobvious and patentable base Claim 1, are unobvious to one skilled in the art and patentable over the above cited references. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

(3) Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 as

HDI 4.1-1
Appl. No. 10/627,066
Response to Office Action dated June 1, 2005
Amdt. dated September 1, 2005

being unpatentable over Kintzi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,782) in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 988,558) and Sawyer (U.S. Patent No. 3,925,822) as applied to Claim 15 above and further in view of Puckett (U.S. Patent No. 3,928,896). The references have been described in detail in a previous Amendment that discussion need not be repeated.

Applicants believe that in view of the Amendment of Claim 1, dependent Claim 16, as depending from unobvious and patentable base Claim 1, is unobvious to one skilled in the art and patentable over the above cited references. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Applicants believe that Claims 1, 3 to 16, 27 and 28 are now in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully,

Mary M. Moyne
Registration No. 35,962

MCLEOD & MOYNE, P.C.
2190 Commons Parkway
Okemos, Michigan 48864

(517) 347-4100
Fax: (517) 347-4103